

a superintendent of those surveyors, as the hon. gentleman did when he placed Mr. Kingsford over them. That office is abolished, and these engineers were placed in charge of the Chief Engineer's Department.

MR. MACKENZIE. Did the hon. gentleman employ other engineers who had not been employed before Mr. Kingsford's dismissal?

MR. LANGEVIN. There may have been some; it is quite possible; but they were only employed for two or three months—perhaps four or five months—at \$4 a day and their travelling expenses, while Mr. Kingsford's salary was \$3,300.

MR. MACKENZIE. Then the fact remains that the hon. gentleman could not find any employment for a man who, I am bound to say, deserved well of the department—a man who is a political opponent of mine, and therefore, I have nothing to say on that account. I have endeavored to treat all the engineers alike, no matter what their politics. Here is a gentleman dismissed who, confessedly, is an able engineer, dismissed unceremoniously, and for a reason that is not an honest reason. The hon. gentleman's reason is very like that for dismissing the inspectors of weights and measures. The law was changed so that the law would dismiss them. The hon. gentleman goes through the farce of changing the arrangements in his office, and so in his small way legislates Mr. Kingsford out of his position and employs other engineers after that, who have been employed to this day. This is the sort of usage that is meted out to men who have rendered good service to the country. I am surprised the hon. gentleman is not ashamed of the treatment he has meted out to that gentleman and to several others in the department.

MR. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may try to be as offensive as he pleases, but he will not compel me to be offensive to him. I shall not lose my temper, but I shall try to be civil, and I hope the hon. gentleman will do the same. Mr. Kingsford was discharged—I will not say dismissed, because I understand that in the English language the word *dismissed* means that a man is sent away for good cause, while the word *discharged* means that he was not required any longer, though he might be a very good man. Therefore, I say Mr. Kingsford was not dismissed but was discharged. I have always found him an able man. It was not I who put him into the department, but it was the hon. gentleman, and therefore I had no reason to find fault with Mr. Kingsford being in the department because I put him there. But his usefulness was gone, the office was no longer required and therefore it was abolished, and Mr. Kingsford left the service. Thinking that, under the circumstances, Mr. Kingsford should have an indemnity I have asked my colleagues to have this put in the Estimates. Mr. Kingsford could not be offered another position in my department because I have none to give him. The officers I require only serve for a few months at a time, and in that way I am able to curtail very considerably the expense, while they are only paid for the work they do.

MR. MACKENZIE. I am not aware I said anything offensive such as the hon. gentleman complains of. I certainly had no intention to be offensive. I am not aware of anything I said which he could call offensive.

MR. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman spoke of my small way of doing business.

MR. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; I said he legislated Mr. Kingsford out in a small way, meaning the legislation of a department as compared with the legislation of Parliament. In the parallel case, I said the inspectors of weights and measures were legislated out of their positions, and the hon. gentleman legislated Mr. Kingsford out of his position in a small way, and if the hon. gentleman understood me to be offensive in that, he is entirely mistaken.

MR. LANGEVIN. There is another thing. The hon. gentleman said the reason I was